

Doubly uniform complete law of large numbers for independent point processes

Tetsuya Hattori *

Laboratory of Mathematics, Faculty of Economics, Keio University,
Hiyoshi Campus, 4-1-1 Hiyoshi, Yokohama 223-8521, Japan

URL: <http://web.econ.keio.ac.jp/staff/hattori/research.htm>

email: hattori@econ.keio.ac.jp

December 30, 2016

Abstract

We prove a law of large numbers in terms of complete convergence of independent random variables taking values in increments of monotone functions, with convergence uniform both in the initial and the final time. The result holds also for the random variables taking values in functions of 2 parameters which share similar monotonicity properties as the increments of monotone functions. The assumptions for the main result are the Hölder continuity on the expectations as well as moment conditions, while the sample functions may contain jumps. In particular, we can apply the results to point processes (counting processes) which lack Markov or martingale type properties.

Keywords: law of large numbers, complete convergence, counting process, sum of independent random processes

2000 MSC Primary 60F15; Secondary 60G55

1 Introduction.

Let $T > 0$, which we fix throughout this paper. Put $\Delta = \{(t_1, t_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid 0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq T\}$, and denote by $\mathcal{D}$ the set of functions $z : \Delta \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ which, for $(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta$, is non-increasing in t_1 and non-decreasing in t_2 , and satisfies $z(t, t) = 0$ for $t \in [0, T]$. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ be a probability space. In this paper, we consider $\mathcal{D}$ valued random variables. Here, we say that Z is a $\mathcal{D}$ valued random variable, if, for each $(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta$, $Z(t_1, t_2) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is almost surely a real valued Borel random variable. An example of $\mathcal{D}$ valued random variable is Z defined by $Z(t_1, t_2) = \tilde{Z}(t_2) - \tilde{Z}(t_1)$ for a point (counting) process $\tilde{Z}$.

In this paper we prove the following.

Theorem 1 *Let $r > 0$ and $q > 2$. For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $Z_i^{(N)}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, be a sequence of independent, $\mathcal{D}$ valued random variables, and let $M_i^{(N)}$ be a positive real, and $w_i^{(N)}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, a non-negative sequence. Assume the following for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$:*

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} (i) \quad & \mathbb{E}[Z_i^{(N)}(0, T)^q]^{1/q} \leq M^{(N)}, \\ (ii) \quad & |\mathbb{E}[Z_i^{(N)}(t_1, t_2) - Z_i^{(N)}(s_1, s_2)]| \leq M^{(N)} w_i^{(N)} (|t_1 - s_1|^r + |t_2 - s_2|^r), \\ & (s_1, s_2), (t_1, t_2) \in \Delta. \end{aligned}$$

*Supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 26400146, and by Keio Gijuku Academic Development Funds.

Then the arithmetic average $Y^{(N)} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i^{(N)}$ satisfies

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta} |Y^{(N)}(t_1, t_2) - \mathbb{E}[Y^{(N)}(t_1, t_2)]|^q \right] \\ & \leq \frac{M^{(N)q} 2^{q-1}}{N^{q^2 r / (2qr + 2r + 2)}} (C_q^q (2T \bar{w}^{(N)1/r} + 1) + 2^{2q}), \\ & N = N_0, N_0 + 1, \dots, \end{aligned}$$

where we put

$$(3) \quad \bar{w}^{(N)} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^{(N)},$$

and N_0 is the smallest integer satisfying $N_0^{qr/(2qr+2r+2)} \geq 2$, and C_q is a positive constant depending only on q .

If in addition, $\{M^{(N)}, \bar{w}^{(N)}\}$ is bounded, and

$$(4) \quad (q^2 - 2q - 2)r > 2$$

holds, then

$$(5) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (Z_i^{(N)}(t_1, t_2) - \mathbb{E}[Z_i^{(N)}(t_1, t_2)]) \right| = 0, \text{ a.e.,}$$

holds. ◇

We note that concerning the dependence of random variables for different N , we are considering a law of large numbers in terms of complete convergence of Hsu and Robbins [6, 3, 4], where we assume nothing about dependence or independence between the variables with different N . In contrast, the law of large numbers for random walks considers a special case where $Z_i^{(N)} = Z_i^{(i)}$, $N \geq i$. Instead of the term *strong law of large numbers*, which often refers to the case of random walks, we shall in this paper refer to (5) the *complete law of large numbers* (uniform in 2 parameters t_1 and t_2).

Note also that we assume Hölder continuity properties (1)(ii) only on the expectation. In particular, the sample paths may contain jumps.

As a straightforward application to processes $Z_i^{(N)}$ with 1 time variable, we can apply Theorem 1 to the increment $Z_i^{(N)}(t_1, t_2) \mapsto Z_i^{(N)}(t_2) - Z_i^{(N)}(t_1)$ of increasing processes (such as point processes) $Z_i^{(N)}$, to obtain the following.

Corollary 2 Let $D_\uparrow = D_\uparrow([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ be the set of non-decreasing, right continuous functions on a closed interval $[0, T]$ with left limits $y(t-0) := \lim_{s \uparrow t} y(s)$. Let $r > 0$ and $q > 2$. For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$Z_i^{(N)} : \Omega \rightarrow D_\uparrow$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, be a sequence of independent, $D_\uparrow$ valued random variables, and let $M_i^{(N)}$ be a positive real, and $w_i^{(N)}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, a non-negative sequence. Assume the following for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} (i) \quad & \mathbb{E} [|Z_i^{(N)}(T) - Z_i^{(N)}(0)|^q]^{1/q} \leq M^{(N)}, \\ (ii) \quad & |\mathbb{E}[Z_i^{(N)}(t)] - \mathbb{E}[Z_i^{(N)}(s)]| \leq M^{(N)} w_i^{(N)} |t - s|^r, \quad s, t \in [0, T], \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{w}^{(N)}$ is as in (3).

Then the arithmetic average $Y^{(N)}(t) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i^{(N)}(t)$ satisfies

$$(7) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta} |Y^{(N)}(t_2) - Y^{(N)}(t_1) - \mathbb{E}[Y^{(N)}(t_2) - Y^{(N)}(t_1)]|^q \right] \\ & \leq \frac{M^{(N)q} 2^{q-1}}{N^{q^2 r / (2qr + 2r + 2)}} (C_q^q (2T \bar{w}^{(N)1/r} + 1) + 2^{2q}), \\ & N = N_0, N_0 + 1, \dots, \end{aligned}$$

where N_0 is the smallest integer satisfying $N_0^{qr/(2qr+2r+2)} \geq 2$, and C_q is a positive constant depending only on q .

If in addition, $\{M^{(N)}, \bar{w}^{(N)}\}$ is bounded, and (4) holds, then a doubly uniform complete law of large numbers

$$(8) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (Z_i^{(N)}(t_2) - Z_i^{(N)}(t_1)) - \mathbb{E}[Z_i^{(N)}(t_2) - Z_i^{(N)}(t_1)] \right| = 0, \text{ a.e.,}$$

holds. ◇

If $Z_i^{(N)}(t) - \mathbb{E}[Z_i^{(N)}(t)]$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, are martingales in t , then we can apply Doob's inequalities to bound the supremums of their sums in t by the values at last time $t = T$, and we can directly apply the law of large numbers for real valued random variables. In contrast, we assume no structures with respect to t other than monotonicity for $Z_i^{(N)}(t)$ in Corollary 2. We give a simple example of such situation in § 3.

Acknowledgment. The author would like to thank Prof. M. Takei for helpful discussions.

2 Doubly uniform bounds for increasing processes.

In this section we prove Theorem 1.

Proposition 3 Assume that $m \in \mathcal{D}$ satisfies $m(0, T) \leq 1$ and is globally Hölder continuous; there exists positive constants r and C such that

$$(9) \quad |m(t_1, t_2) - m(s_1, s_2)| \leq C|t_1 - s_1|^r + C|t_2 - s_2|^r, \quad (s_1, s_2), (t_1, t_2) \in \Delta$$

Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a finite set $\Delta^* = \{(t_{k,1}, t_{k,2}) \in \Delta \mid k = 1, 2, \dots, K\}$, satisfying

$$(10) \quad K \leq (2n - 1)T(Cn)^{1/r} + 1,$$

such that

$$(11) \quad \sup_{(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta} |y(t_1, t_2) - m(t_1, t_2)| \leq \bigvee_{k=1}^K |y(t_{k,1}, t_{k,2}) - m(t_{k,1}, t_{k,2})| + \frac{2}{n}$$

holds for any $y \in \mathcal{D}$, where $\bigvee_{k=1}^K c_k$ denotes the largest value in $\{c_k\}$. ◇

The following lemma is the technical core of this section.

Lemma 4 Assume that $m \in \mathcal{D}$ satisfies $m(0, T) \leq 1$ and that there exists a positive constant r and C such that (9) holds. Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a finite set $\Delta^* = \{(t_{i,1}, t_{i,2}) \in \Delta \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, K\}$, of size K satisfying a bound (10), such that for each $(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta$, there exists $(s_1, s_2) \in \Delta_n^*$ such that

$$(12) \quad s_1 \leq t_1, \quad t_2 \leq s_2, \quad \text{and} \quad m(s_1, s_2) - \frac{2}{n} \leq m(t_1, t_2),$$

and

$$(13) \quad \text{either } m(t_1, t_2) \leq \frac{1}{n}, \quad \text{or, there exists } (u_1, u_2) \in \Delta_n^* \text{ such that}$$

$$t_1 \leq u_1, \quad u_2 \leq t_2, \quad \text{and} \quad m(t_1, t_2) \leq m(u_1, u_2) + \frac{2}{n}.$$

◇

Proof. Note that monotonicity in the definition of $\mathcal{D}$ implies that the maximum value of m is attained at $(0, T)$ and the minimum is $m(t, t) = 0$, $t \in [0, T]$. We omit the trivial case of m being identically 0, and consider the case $m(0, T) > 0$.

Fix n and put

$$(14) \quad \Delta_{n,i} = \{(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta \mid \frac{i}{n} < m(t_1, t_2) \leq \frac{i+1}{n}\}, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n-1.$$

Since m takes values in $[0, 1]$, there is a partition of Δ in terms of $\{\Delta_{n,i}, i = 0, \dots, n-1\}$;


$$(15) \quad \Delta = \{(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta \mid m(t_1, t_2) = 0\} \cup \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} \Delta_{n,i}.$$

Denote by i_{max} the index such that $(0, T) \in \Delta_{n,i_{max}}$. Then since m is continuous, the mean value theorem and monotonicity imply

$$(16) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 \leq i \leq i_{max} &\Leftrightarrow \Delta_{n,i} \neq \emptyset, \\ 0 \leq m(t_1, t_2) &\leq \frac{i_{max} + 1}{n}, \quad (t_1, t_2) \in \Delta. \end{aligned}$$

Fix $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, i_{max}\}$, and define $t_{k,1}$ and $t_{k,2}$ inductively in $k = 1, 2, \dots$, by

$$(17) \quad \begin{aligned} t_{0,2} &= T, \\ t_{k,1} &= \inf\{s \in [0, T] \mid m(s, t_{k-1,2}) \in \Delta_{n,i-1}\} \\ &= \inf\{s \in [0, T] \mid m(s, t_{k-1,2}) \leq \frac{i}{n}\}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, \\ t_{k,2} &= \inf\{s \in [0, T] \mid m(t_{k,1}, s) \in \Delta_{n,i-1}\} \\ &= \inf\{s \in [0, T] \mid m(t_{k,1}, s) > \frac{i-1}{n}\}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned}$$



Monotonicity of m implies that $t_{k,1}$ and $t_{k,2}$ of (17) are respectively non-increasing in k , and the continuity of m implies

$$(18) \quad m(t_{k,1}, t_{k,2}) = \frac{i-1}{n}, \quad m(t_{k,1}, t_{k-1,2}) = \frac{i}{n}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots$$

This and the assumption of Hölder continuity (9) imply

$$t_{k,2} - t_{k+1,2} \geq (Cn)^{-1/r}, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \quad \text{and} \quad t_{k,1} - t_{k+1,1} \geq (Cn)^{-1/r}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots,$$

so that if we denote the length of the sequence $(t_{k,1}, t_{k,2})$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$ by a , then $a \leq T(Cn)^{1/r}$, and the definition of a also implies $\frac{i-1}{n} \leq m(0, t_{a,2}) \leq \frac{i}{n}$.

Let $(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta_{n,i}$. Monotonicity, $m(0, t_{a,2}) \leq \frac{i}{n}$, and (14) imply

$$(19) \quad \exists k \in \{1, 2, \dots, a\}; \quad t_{k,2} < t_2 \leq t_{k-1,2}.$$

This and monotonicity and $(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta_{n,i}$ and (18) together imply

$$m(t_{k,1}, t_2) \leq m(t_{k,1}, t_{k-1,2}) = \frac{i}{n} < m(t_1, t_2),$$

which further implies

$$(20) \quad t_1 < t_{k,1}$$

and

$$(21) \quad m(t_1, t_2) \leq \frac{i}{n} + \frac{1}{n} = m(t_{k,1}, t_{k,2}) + \frac{2}{n}.$$

Denote by $\Delta_+^* = \{(t_{\ell,1}, t_{\ell,2}) \in \Delta \mid \ell = 1, 2, \dots, a'\}$, the union of so obtained $\{(t_{k,1}, t_{k,2}) \mid k = 1, \dots, a\}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, i_{\max}$. In particular, since $a \leq T(Cn)^{1/r}$ for each i , $a' \leq nT(Cn)^{1/r}$. Combining (15), (16), (19), (20), and (21), we have

$$(22) \quad (\forall (t_1, t_2) \in \Delta \setminus (\{(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta \mid m(t_1, t_2) = 0\} \cup \Delta_{n,0})) \\ \exists (u_1, u_2) \in \Delta_+^*; \quad t_1 < u_1, \quad t_2 \geq u_2 \quad \text{and} \quad m(t_1, t_2) \leq m(u_1, u_2) + \frac{2}{n}.$$

This completes a proof of (13).

A proof of the remaining bound is similarly proved. Fix n , and put

$$(23) \quad \Delta'_{n,i} = \{(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta \mid \frac{i}{n} \leq m(t_1, t_2) < \frac{i+1}{n}\}, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, n.$$

Then

$$(24) \quad \Delta = \bigcup_{i=0}^n \Delta'_{n,i}.$$

Define an integer $i_{max} \leq n$ by


$$(25) \quad 0 \leq i \leq i_{max} \Leftrightarrow \Delta'_{n,i} \neq \emptyset.$$

Then

$$(26) \quad 0 \leq m(t_1, t_2) < \frac{i_{max} + 1}{n}, \quad (t_1, t_2) \in \Delta.$$

Fix $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, i_{max} - 2\}$, and define $t'_{k,1}$ and $t'_{k,2}$ inductively in $k = 1, 2, \dots$, by

$$(27) \quad \begin{aligned} t'_{1,2} &= T, \\ t'_{k,1} &= \inf\{s \in [0, T] \mid m(s, t'_{k,2}) \in \Delta'_{n,i+1}\} \\ &= \inf\{s \in [0, T] \mid m(s, t'_{k,2}) < \frac{i+2}{n}\}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, \\ t'_{k,2} &= \inf\{s \in [0, T] \mid m(t'_{k-1,1}, s) \in \Delta'_{n,i+1}\} \\ &= \inf\{s \in [0, T] \mid m(t'_{k-1,1}, s) \geq \frac{i+1}{n}\}, \quad k = 2, 3, \dots \end{aligned}$$



Monotonicity of m implies that $t'_{k,1}$ and $t'_{k,2}$ are respectively non-increasing in k , and the continuity of m implies

$$(28) \quad m(t'_{k,1}, t'_{k,2}) = \frac{i+2}{n}, \quad m(t'_{k,1}, t'_{k+1,2}) = \frac{i+1}{n}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots$$

This and the assumption of Hölder continuity (9) imply, as before, that there exists an integer b satisfying $b \leq T(Cn)^{1/r}$ and $\frac{i+1}{n} \leq m(0, t'_{b,2}) \leq \frac{i+2}{n}$, such that the sequences $t'_{k,1}$ and $t'_{k,2}$ in k are of length b . Put $t'_{b,1} = 0$ for notational convenience below.

Let $(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta'_{n,i}$. Then

$$(29) \quad t_1 \geq t'_{1,1} \quad \text{or} \quad \exists k \in \{2, 3, \dots, b\}; \quad t'_{k,1} \leq t_1 < t'_{k-1,1}.$$

This and monotonicity and $(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta'_{n,i}$ and (28) together imply

$$m(t_1, t_2) \leq \frac{i+1}{n} = m(t'_{k-1,1}, t'_{k,2}) < m(t_1, t'_{k,2}),$$

which further implies

$$(30) \quad t_2 < t'_{k,2}$$

and

$$(31) \quad m(t'_{k,1}, t'_{k,2}) = \frac{i+2}{n} \leq m(t_1, t_2) + \frac{2}{n}.$$

Denote by $\Delta_-^* = \{(t'_{\ell,1}, t'_{\ell,2}) \in \Delta \mid \ell = 1, 2, \dots, b'\}$, the union of $\{(0, T)\}$ and so obtained $\{(t'_{k,1}, t'_{k,2}) \mid k = 1, \dots, b\}$ for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, i_{max} - 2$. In particular, since $b \leq T(Cn)^{1/r}$ for each i , and $i_{max} - 2 \leq n - 2$, we have $b' \leq (n-1)T(Cn)^{1/r} + 1$. Combining (24), (25), (26), (29), (30), and (31), we have

$$(32) \quad (\forall (t_1, t_2) \in \Delta \setminus (\Delta'_{n,i_{max}-1} \cup \Delta'_{n,i_{max}}) \exists (s_1, s_2) \in \Delta_-^*; \\ t_1 \geq s_1, t_2 < s_2 \text{ and } m(t_1, t_2) \geq m(s_1, s_2) - \frac{2}{n}.$$

If $(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta'_{n,i_{max}} \cup \Delta'_{n,i_{max}-1}$, then $t_1 \geq 0$ and $t_2 \leq T$, and also (23), (25), and the monotonicity of m imply $m(t_1, t_2) \geq m(0, T) - \frac{2}{n}$. Since we included $(0, T)$ explicitly in Δ_-^* , the existence of (s_1, s_2) satisfying the estimates in (32) holds also for this case. This completes a proof of $m(s_1, s_2) - \frac{2}{n} \leq m(t_1, t_2)$ in (12).

Finally, we put $\Delta_n^* = \Delta_+^* \cup \Delta_-^*$. Then

$$K = \#\Delta_n^* \leq a' + b' \leq (2n-1)(T(Cn)^{1/r} + 1) + 1,$$

which proves (10). $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3. Let $(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta$. If $y(t_1, t_2) \geq m(t_1, t_2)$, then, Lemma 4 and monotonicity of y imply that, there exists $(s_1, s_2) \in \Delta_n^*$ such that,

$$\begin{aligned} |y(t_1, t_2) - m(t_1, t_2)| &= y(t_1, t_2) - m(t_1, t_2) \\ &\leq (y(s_1, s_2) - m(s_1, s_2)) + (m(s_1, s_2) - m(t_1, t_2)) \\ &\leq |y(s_1, s_2) - m(s_1, s_2)| + \frac{2}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Assume in the following that $y(t_1, t_2) \leq m(t_1, t_2)$. Note that the assumptions on y implies that y is non-negative. If $m(t_1, t_2) \leq \frac{1}{n}$, then Lemma 4 and nonnegativity of y imply that

$$|y(t_1, t_2) - m(t_1, t_2)| = m(t_1, t_2) - y(t_1, t_2) \leq \frac{1}{n}.$$

If $m(t_1, t_2) > \frac{1}{n}$, then Lemma 4 and monotonicity of y imply that, there exists (u_1, u_2) in Δ_n^* such that,

$$\begin{aligned} |y(t_1, t_2) - m(t_1, t_2)| &\leq (m(u_1, u_2) - y(u_1, u_2)) + (m(t_1, t_2) - m(u_1, u_2)) \\ &\leq |y(u_1, u_2) - m(u_1, u_2)| + \frac{2}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore (11) holds.

Lemma 4 also implies the claimed bound on K , the size of Δ_n^* . $\square$

Corollary 5 *Let Y be a random variable taking values in $\mathcal{D}$. Assume that*

$$(33) \quad \begin{aligned} &|E[Y(t_1, t_2) - Y(s_1, s_2)]| \leq CE[Y(0, T)] (|t_1 - s_1|^r + |t_2 - s_2|^r), \\ &(s_1, s_2), (t_1, t_2) \in \Delta, \end{aligned}$$

holds for some $r > 0$ and $C > 0$. Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for any $q \geq 1$,

$$(34) \quad \begin{aligned} &E[\sup_{(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta} |Y(t_1, t_2) - E[Y(t_1, t_2)]|^q] \\ &\leq 2^{q-1}((2n-1)T(Cn)^{1/r} + 1) \sup_{(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta} E[|Y(t_1, t_2) - E[Y(t_1, t_2)]|^q] \\ &\quad + 2^{q-1} \left(\frac{2}{n} \right)^q E[Y(0, T)]^q \end{aligned}$$

holds.

◇

Proof. For each sample $\omega \in \Omega$, Proposition 3 with

$$y(t_1, t_2) = \frac{Y(\omega)(t_1, t_2)}{E[Y(0, T)]}, \quad m(t_1, t_2) = \frac{E[Y(t_1, t_2)]}{E[Y(0, T)]}$$

implies that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $K \geq 1$ and a finite set

$$\Delta^* = \{(t_{k,1}, t_{k,2}) \in \Delta \mid k = 1, 2, \dots, K\},$$

independent of sample ω , such that

$$(35) \quad K \leq (2n-1)T(Cn)^{1/r} + 1,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta} |Y(\omega)(t_1, t_2) - E[Y(t_1, t_2)]| \\ &\leq \bigvee_{k=1}^K |Y(\omega)(t_{k,1}, t_{k,2}) - E[Y(t_{k,1}, t_{k,2})]| + \frac{2}{n} E[Y(0, T)]. \end{aligned}$$

This, with an elementary inequality

$$(36) \quad a^p + b^p \leq (a + b)^p \leq 2^{p-1}(a^p + b^p),$$

valid for all positive a and b with $p \geq 1$, implies

$$\begin{aligned} &E[\sup_{(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta} |Y(t_1, t_2) - E[Y(t_1, t_2)]|^q] \\ &\leq 2^{q-1} E[\left(\bigvee_{k=1}^K |Y(t_{k,1}, t_{k,2}) - E[Y(t_{k,1}, t_{k,2})]| \right)^q] + 2^{q-1} \left(\frac{2}{n} \right)^q E[Y(0, T)]^q \\ &= 2^{q-1} E[\bigvee_{k=1}^K |Y(t_{k,1}, t_{k,2}) - E[Y(t_{k,1}, t_{k,2})]|^q] + 2^{q-1} \left(\frac{2}{n} \right)^q E[Y(0, T)]^q \\ &\leq 2^{q-1} \sum_{k=1}^K E[|Y(t_{k,1}, t_{k,2}) - E[Y(t_{k,1}, t_{k,2})]|^q] + 2^{q-1} \left(\frac{2}{n} \right)^q E[Y(0, T)]^q, \end{aligned}$$

which, with (35), implies (34).

□

We will see that the results so far reduce the claim of Theorem 1 to the complete law of large numbers for real valued random variables. It is known [6, 3, 4] that a necessary and sufficient condition for the complete convergence of identically distributed real valued random variables with finite expectation is the existence of variance. Stated in terms of a complete law of large numbers, existence of variance or the second order moment suffices for the strong law to hold [2, §10.4, Example 1]. A generalized result for the case of varying distribution is also known [7]. We will use the results in the following form. See the references for a proof.

Proposition 6 *For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\tilde{Z}_i^{(N)} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, be a finite sequence of independent, real valued random variables, and put $\tilde{Y}^{(N)} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{Z}_i^{(N)}$. Assume that there exists $q > 2$ such that*

$$M^{(N)} := \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, N\}} \mathbb{E}[|\tilde{Z}_i^{(N)}|^q]^{1/q} < \infty.$$

Then there exists a positive constant C_q depending only on q , (in particular, independent of N and $M^{(N)}$), such that

$$(37) \quad \mathbb{E}[|\tilde{Y}^{(N)} - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Y}^{(N)}]|^q]^{1/q} \leq \frac{C_q M^{(N)}}{\sqrt{N}},$$

hold. ◇

We can for example put

$$C_q = \left(\frac{1}{2}(4k)^q + \frac{2k}{2k-q}(8k)^q \right)^{1/q},$$

in (37), where k is the smallest integer greater than $q/2$.

We are ready to prove Theorem 1, the complete law of large numbers for the arithmetic average of $Z_i^{(N)}(t_1, t_2)$, uniform both in t_1 and t_2 .

Proof of Theorem 1. Note first that the assumption (1)(i) implies

$$(38) \quad \sup_{\substack{i=1,2,\dots,N, \\ (t_1,t_2) \in \Delta}} \mathbb{E}[|Z_i^{(N)}(t_1, t_2)|^q]^{1/q} \leq M^{(N)},$$

because of monotonicity.

The assumption (1)(ii) imply that

$$Y := \frac{1}{M^{(N)}} Y^{(N)} = \frac{1}{N M^{(N)}} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i^{(N)}$$

satisfies all the assumptions in Corollary 5, with $C = \overline{w}^{(N)}$ in (33). Corollary 5 and Proposition 6 therefore imply,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta} |Y^{(N)}(t_1, t_2) - \mathbb{E}[Y^{(N)}(t_1, t_2)]|^q \right] \\ & \leq 2^{q-1} ((2n-1)T(\overline{w}^{(N)} n)^{1/r} + 1) \frac{(C_q M^{(N)})^q}{N^{q/2}} + 2^{q-1} \left(\frac{2M^{(N)}}{n} \right)^q \end{aligned}$$

for positive integers n and N . Now for each N , fix $n = n_N$ to be the largest integer not greater than $N^{rq/(2qr+2r+2)}$. If $N_0^{rq/(2qr+2r+2)} \geq 2$, then for $N \geq N_0$, $\frac{1}{2} N^{rq/(2qr+2r+2)} < n_N \leq N^{rq/(2qr+2r+2)}$, and we have (2).

The assumption (4) and just proved result (2) imply

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{N=N_0}^{\infty} \sup_{(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta} |Y^{(N)}(t_1, t_2) - \mathbb{E}[Y^{(N)}(t_1, t_2)]|^q \right] < \infty,$$

which implies (5). $\square$

If the moment condition (1)(i) holds for arbitrarily large exponent q , the doubly uniform complete law of large numbers holds with ‘order of fluctuation’ arbitrary close to $1/2$, as expected.

Theorem 7 For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $Z_i^{(N)} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, be a sequence of independent, $\mathcal{D}$ valued random variables. Let $r > 0$, and for $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $M^{(N)}$ be a positive real and $w_i^{(N)}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, a non-negative sequence. Assume the following for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$(39) \quad \begin{aligned} (i) \quad & \mathbb{E}[|Z_i^{(N)}(0, T)|^q]^{1/q} \leq M^{(N)}, \quad q \in \mathbb{N}, \\ (ii) \quad & |\mathbb{E}[Z_i^{(N)}(t_1, t_2)] - \mathbb{E}[Z_i^{(N)}(s_1, s_2)]| \leq M^{(N)} w_i^{(N)} (|t_1 - s_1|^r + |t_2 - s_2|^r), \\ & (s_1, s_2), (t_1, t_2) \in \Delta. \end{aligned}$$

Then for any $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, and $p > 0$ the average $Y^{(N)} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i^{(N)}$ satisfies

$$(40) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta} |Y^{(N)}(t_1, t_2) - \mathbb{E}[Y^{(N)}(t_1, t_2)]|^p \right]^{1/p} \\ & \leq \frac{M^{(N)}}{N^\gamma} 2^{1-1/q} (C_q^q (2T(\overline{w}^{(N)})^{1/r} + 1) + 2^{2q})^{1/q}, \\ & N = N_0, N_0 + 1, \dots, \end{aligned}$$

where $\overline{w}^{(N)}$ is as in (3), C_q as in Proposition 6, $N_0 = N_0(r, q)$ is the smallest integer satisfying $N_0^{rq/(2rq+2r+2)} \geq 2$, and $q = q(p, \gamma) = 3 \vee \frac{r+1}{r} \frac{2\gamma}{1-2\gamma} \vee p$. (In particular, q and N_0 are independent of N , $M^{(N)}$, and $\overline{w}^{(N)}$.)

If in addition, $\{M^{(N)}, \overline{w}^{(N)}\}$ is bounded, then a strong uniform law of large numbers (5) holds.

$\diamond$

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 1, we have (5) for all N and q .

Let $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $p > 0$, and choose $q = 3 \vee 2 \frac{r+1}{r} \frac{\gamma}{1-2\gamma} \vee p$. Then $q \geq 2 \frac{r+1}{r} \frac{\gamma}{1-2\gamma}$ implies $\frac{rq}{2rq+2r+2} \geq \gamma$, hence, the monotonicity of L_p norms and (5) imply

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta} |Y^{(N)}(t_1, t_2) - \mathbb{E}[Y^{(N)}(t_1, t_2)]|^p \right]^{1/p} \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta} |Y^{(N)}(t_1, t_2) - \mathbb{E}[Y^{(N)}(t_1, t_2)]|^q \right]^{1/q} \\ & \leq \frac{M^{(N)}}{N^\gamma} 2^{1-1/q} (C_q^q (2T(\overline{w}^{(N)})^{1/r} + 1) + 2^{2q})^{1/q}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (40). The argument for the proof of (5) in the proof of Theorem 1 also proves (5) in Theorem 7. $\square$

3 Example of point processes with dependent increments.

Results without assuming extra structures for counting processes as in Corollary 2 could be of use in practical situations. For example, consider a new large office building with a large number, say N , of lighting equipments. Each light bulb has a random lifetime, which may depend on the location $(i = 1, 2, \dots, N)$ in the building. The distribution of each lifetime also could depend in a mathematically cumbersome way on the latest time the light bulb burnt out, because the light bulb products in the market are updated according to e.g., advances in technology or regulation on materials. We would be interested in estimating the number of bulbs to be replaced in the time period $[t_1, t_2]$, which is the random number $N(Y^{(N)}(t_2) - Y^{(N)}(t_1))$ in terms of the notations in Corollary 2. (Note also that in these practical applications where N is finite and fixed, a complete law of large numbers as we consider should be natural than a strong law of large numbers which assumes relation between random variables with different N .)

As an example of point process with dependent increments we consider the point process $Z_i^{(N)}(t)$ with last-arrival-time dependent intensity [5, §3]. For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, the sequence $\tau_{i,0}^{(N)} = 0 < \tau_{i,1}^{(N)} < \dots$ of arrival times are random times defined inductively by

$$(41) \quad \mathbb{P}[t < \tau_{i,k}^{(N)} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\tau_{i,k-1}^{(N)}}] = \exp\left(-\int_{\tau_{i,k-1}^{(N)}}^t w_i^{(N)}(\tau_{i,k-1}^{(N)}, u) du\right) \quad \text{on } t \geq \tau_{i,k-1}^{(N)},$$

where, $w_i^{(N)}$ is a non-negative continuously differentiable function defined on

$$(t_0, t) \in \Delta = \{(t_1, t_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid 0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq T\},$$

to which we refer as the intensity function of the counting process

$$(42) \quad Z_i^{(N)}(t) = \max\{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \mid \tau_{i,k}^{(N)} \leq t\}.$$

If $w_i^{(N)}$ is independent of the first variable, the definition of $Z_i^{(N)}$ reduces to that of the Poisson process with intensity function $w_i^{(N)}$, but in general, unlike the Poisson processes, $Z_i^{(N)}$ is not of independent increment.

Theorem 8 *For $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i = 1, \dots, N$, let $w_i^{(N)} : \Delta \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a non-negative continuously differentiable function, and $Z_i^{(N)}$ a process determined by (42). If $Z_i^{(N)}$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, are independent for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and $C := \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{i \in \{1, \dots, N\}} \sup_{(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta} w_i^{(N)}(t_1, t_2) < \infty$, then a strong uniform law of large numbers*

$$(43) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(t_1, t_2) \in \Delta} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (Z_i^{(N)}(t_1, t_2) - \mathbb{E}[Z_i^{(N)}](t_1, t_2)) \right| = 0, \quad \text{a.e.,}$$

holds for the number of arrival times in the intervals

$$(44) \quad Z_i^{(N)}(t_1, t_2) := Z_i^{(N)}(t_2) - Z_i^{(N)}(t_1), \quad 0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq T.$$

◇

Proof. Note that $Z_i^{(N)}(0) = 0$. It is known [5, §3, Thm. 5] that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[Z_i^{(N)}(t)(Z_i^{(N)}(t) - 1) \cdots (Z_i^{(N)}(t) - q + 1)] \\ & \leq \left(\int_0^t \max_{s \in [0, u]} w_i^{(N)}(s, u) du \right)^q \leq (CT)^q, \end{aligned}$$

holds for all positive integer q . For each positive integers q , N , and i , $Z \geq 2q$ implies $Z - 1 > Z - 2 > \cdots > Z - q + 1 > \frac{1}{2}Z > 0$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} (45) \quad & \mathbb{E}[|Z_i^{(N)}(T)|^q] \\ & = \mathbb{E}[Z_i^{(N)}(T)^q; Z_i^{(N)}(T) \geq 2q] + \mathbb{E}[Z_i^{(N)}(T)^q; Z_i^{(N)}(T) < 2q] \\ & \leq 2^q \mathbb{E}[Z_i^{(N)}(T) \cdots (Z_i^{(N)}(T) - q + 1)] + (2q)^q \\ & \leq (2CT)^q + (2q)^q. \end{aligned}$$

Let $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$ and put $\Omega(s, t) = \int_s^t w(s, u) du$. According to [5, §3], we have explicit formulas

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[Z_i^{(N)}(t) - Z_i^{(N)}(s)] \\ & = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_s^t \left(\int_{0 \leq u_1 \leq \cdots \leq u_k} w(u_{k-1}, u_k) e^{-\Omega(u_{k-1}, u_k)} \right. \\ & \quad \times \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} w(u_{i-1}, u_i) e^{-\Omega(u_{i-1}, u_i)} \Big|_{u_0=0} du_i \Big) du_k \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-\Omega(0, t)} \\ & + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{0 \leq u_1 \leq u_2 \leq \cdots \leq u_k \leq t} e^{-\Omega(u_k, t)} \prod_{i=1}^k w(u_{i-1}, u_i) e^{-\Omega(u_{i-1}, u_i)} \Big|_{u_0=0} du_i \\ & = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Using nonnegativity of each terms and an assumption $w_i^{(N)}(u_{k-1}, u_k) \leq C$

$$(46) \quad \mathbb{E}[Z_i^{(N)}(t) - Z_i^{(N)}(s)] \leq C \int_s^t 1 du \leq C(t - s).$$

The estimates (45) and (46), and Theorem 7 in § 2 with $M^{(N)} = 1$, $w_i^{(N)} = C$, and $r = 1$ imply (43). $\square$

References

- [1] P. Billingsley, *Convergence of Probability Measures*, 2nd ed., John Wiley & Sons, 1999.
- [2] Y. S. Chow, H. Teicher, *Probability theory, independence, interchangeability, martingales*, 3rd ed., Springer, 2003.
- [3] P. Erdős, *On a Theorem of Hsu and Robbins*, Ann. Math. Stat. **20** (1949) 286–291.

- [4] P. Erdős, *Remark on my Paper ‘On a Theorem of Hsu and Robbins’*, Ann. Math. Stat. **21** (1950) 138.
- [5] T. Hattori, *Point process with last-arrival-time dependent intensity and 1-dimensional incompressible fluid system with evaporation*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.5117>, Funkcialaj Ekvacioj (2017), to appear.
- [6] P. L. Hsu, H. Robbins, *Complete convergence and the law of large numbers*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **33** (1947) 25–31.
- [7] R. L. Taylor, T. C. Hu, *Strong laws of large numbers for arrays of rowwise independent random elements*, Internat. J. Math. Math. Sci. **10** (1987) 805–814.